

# SODŌ MORI

## THE *MILINDAPAÑHA* AND THE PĀLI ATTHAKATHĀ LITERATURE

### 1. *Introduction*

In the history of the Pāli Buddhist literature, as is well known, the *Milindapañha*<sup>1</sup> is situated, together with the *Nettipakaraṇa* and the *Peṭakopadesa*, between the Pāli canon (Tipiṭaka) and the

---

\* This is a revised version in English of my Japanese paper which was contributed to the *Indian Thoughts and Buddhist Culture: Essays in Honour of Professor Junkichi Imanishi on His Sixtieth Birthday*, pp. 710-726, Tokyo, Shunjūsha, 1996. The references to Pāli texts are to the Pāli Text Society's editions unless otherwise specified. Abbreviations follow the Epilogomena to Vol. I of *A Critical Pāli Dictionary*. Copenhagen, 1948. I am grateful to Ms. Karen Brombaugh from America for her improving my English in this paper, and also to Mr. Kazushige Yamakawa for his every cooperation.

<sup>1</sup> As for the original title of this text, the following three forms have been used: (1) *Milindapañho* (nom., sg., masc.), (2) *Milindapañhā* (nom., sg., fern. or nom., pl., masc.), (3) *Milindapañha* (stem, masc.). It is reported, in addition, that *Milindapañhami* (nom., sg., nt.) appears in a manuscript of Sri Lanka. Cf. Prof. NAKAMURA's study (n. 6), p. 67. This paper adopts the form of (3), which is usually shown in Pāli dictionaries. Regarding the gender of (2), TRENCKNER (Mil, 1962, Preface, p. vi) took it as "nom., sg., fem. Stet", and Mizuno (*Pāli-Japanese Dictionary*, Tokyo 1968) did it as "nom, pl., masc.". Incidentally, *praśna* in Sanskrit for *pañha* in Pāli is taken as the masculine form in Sanskrit dictionaries.

*āthakathā* literature, i. e. the Pāli commentaries<sup>2</sup>. These three are called the semi-canonical texts and are all rather unique books which were originally composed in certain schools in ancient India other than the Theravādins and which were later accepted by this school. The *Milindapañha* is regarded, above all, as a very important noteworthy text, partly because its Chinese version, the *Na-sen-bi-ku-kyo* (*Na-hsien-pi-chiu-ching*)<sup>3</sup> has been preserved, which is a considerably rare example as far as the Pāli non-canonical texts are concerned, and also partly because it contains a high standard dialogue on Buddhist doctrine between King Milinda (Menandoros), a Greek king reigning in the north-east area of ancient India (now within Pakistan) and Nāgasenatthera, an eminent Buddhist monk leading the Order at that time.

Consequently, the studies of the *Milindapañha*, e.g. the publications of its critical editions, its translations into modern languages, and its philological or doctrinal researches, have been making great progress in the present time. In particular, its philological studies have been remarkably improved in the recent several decades by Japanese scholars such as Professors Watsuji<sup>4</sup>, Mizuno<sup>5</sup>, and Nakamura<sup>6</sup>.

---

<sup>2</sup> The Pāli commentaries refer here to the primary commentaries of the Pāli canon, and the *Visuddhimagga*, the major work of Buddhaghosa. See S. MORI, *A Study of the Pāli Commentaries, Theravādīc Aspects of the Āthakathās*, Tokyo: Sankibo, 1984 (in Japanese); its abridged English version: *Studies of the Pāli Commentaries*, Tokyo, S. Mori 1989.

<sup>3</sup> *The Taisho Edition of Chinese Buddhist Texts*, Vol. XXXII, pp. 694a - 703c, 703c - 719a. There are two versions preserved of this text with the same title: Taisho No. 1670 (A) in two fascicles, and No. 1670 (B) in three fascicles. They were originally one and the same translation in three fascicles, but through an extremely long span of time for transmitting their manuscripts, the present two-fascicle-version has been missing some portions in the middle and has contained certain confusions of the context; while the three-fascicle-version has been altered more than the other as to its terms and phrases of the passages. Although these two versions are equally recorded in tradition as translated in the Tou-Shin (Tung-Chin) period (317-420) by an unknown translator, the original translation is very likely to have been made within the Go-Kan (Hou-Han) period (25-220 A. D.) perhaps in the second century A. D. Cf. Prof. MIZUNO's study (n. 5), pp.23-34.

<sup>4</sup> T. WATSUJI, "The *Milindapañha* and its Chinese Version, the *Na-sen-bi-ku-kyo*" (in Japanese) in *The Complete Works of Tetsuro Watsuji*, Vol. V, pp. 431-485,

However, research on the relations between the *Milindapañha* and the Pāli commentaries has not yet been done adequately, although the latter texts quote or refer to the former at many places, which indicates a very close relation between the two. This problem is really important even in connection with the matter of deciding the time of the final formation of the *Milindapañha*. I would like, therefore, to discuss this problem in the following as detailed as possible.

## 2. *The Milindapañha as Quoted in the Atṭhakathās*

In order to search for the relation of the *Milindapañha* with the *atṭhakathā* literature, Professor Mizuno examined the passages of Mil. which are quoted or referred to in the *atṭhakathās* as a comparison between the two related texts, and made a list of them<sup>7</sup> as a conclusion. While I independently made another list of them, that is a reverse list<sup>8</sup>. The quotations of Mil in the *atṭhakathās* are comparatively easy to find since certain words for addressing etc., such as “*Milindarāja*”, “*mahārāja*”, and “*Nāgasena[-thera]*” could be good clues to them. The above two sorts of list, however, still have some defects and imperfections. Therefore, I have made a new list revising these two together. I will show the results along with necessary comments and remarks in the following.

**(Explanatory notes:** the references are made here following the order of pagination of the *Milindapañha* on which its passages are

Tokyo: Iwanami, March 1962. This paper was initially published in a journal called *Kokoro* in 1958.

<sup>5</sup> K. MIZUNO, “On the texts of the *Milindapañha*” (in Japanese), in *The Bulletin of Komazawa University*, 17, pp. 17-55, Tokyo 1959.

<sup>6</sup> H. NAKAMURA, *The Exchange of Thought between India and Greece: The Selected Works of Hajime Nakamura*, (in Japanese), Vol. XVI, pp. 67-89, Tokyo: Shunjyū-sha, 1968.

<sup>7</sup> K. MIZUNO, *op. cit.* (n.5), pp.52-53. This is a “*Milindapañha-Atṭhakathā List*”.

<sup>8</sup> S. MORI, *op. cit.* (n.2), pp. 86-91. This is an “*Atṭhakathā-Milindapañha List*”.

quoted or referred to in the *atthakathās*, i.e. in “*Milindapañha-Atthakathā*” order. **Roman numerals** indicate the volume numbers of the texts; **Arabic numbers** show the paginations of each text. **Lines** are also expressed by Arabic numbers with the abbreviated Italic letter, “*l.*” or “*ll.*”. **The sign of equality (=)** means that the respective passages of the two (or more) sources connected with it are identical with each other in principle).

(1) Mil 33, *ll.* 15-19 = Nidd-a I, 124, *ll.* 4 - 6.  
=Vibh-a 331, *ll.* 12-14.

In this case, the passage of the above place in Mil, of which two or three lines in between are omitted, is the same as the quoted passages in Nidd-a I and Vibh-a respectively. Nidd-a I and Vibh-a are identified not only in the above passages, but also in their preceding and following passages, i. e. “Nidd-a I, 123, *l.* 33 - 125, *l.* 11 = Vibh-a 331, *l.* 6 - 332, *l.* 19”. Consequently, it is clear that the quotations in Nidd-a and Vibh-a are not directly derived from Mil itself. With respect to this identical relation, a question which was the source text for the other, or whether or not they respectively quoted their passages from any third source, cannot be definitely answered as far as we judge it only on the basis of this example. However, it would be rather unnatural to consider that these two passages were cited from the third source, because the possibility that each of the two commentaries exactly and separately cited the same number of lines of the passage of Mil from the third source, would be the lowest, unless the whole quoted passage was accurately all that was already stated as the passage of Mil in the third source.

Further, Nidd-a I is regarded as a work written by Upasena in Sri Lanka in the 430's A.D.<sup>9</sup>, whereas in Vibh-a, in spite of being traditionally attributed to Buddhaghosa, it is strongly doubted as to his authorship, so that its date of writing cannot be decided

---

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 549-553.

conclusively. Moreover, no respective citation nor respective reference to their names can be found in either of them. Consequently, the question which one was composed earlier than the other is unsettled<sup>10</sup>.

Example 23 is a case, however, that Vibh-a directly quoted a passage of Mil, while, on the other hand, there is no case that Nidd-a I directly quoted any passage of Mil. The above fact shows the highest possibility that Nidd-a I copied Vibh-a as for the passage under consideration.

(2) Mil 35, ll. 3-24 = As 119, l. 18-120, l. 2.

In As, a passage that is identical with that of Mil begins with a sentence, “*Ten’āha āyasmā Nāgaseno:*”. Instead of this sentence, a different one, “*Opammap karohīti –*” appears in Mil. The passages in question are rather long sentences: 22 lines in Mil, and 20 lines in As, which are easily identified as similar to each other. Accordingly, it is strongly suggested that the passage in As is a direct quotation from Mil.

(3) Mil 36, ll. 22-26 = As 120, l. 32-121, l. 2.

As is the same as in Example 2 stated above, the passage in Mil under consideration begins with “*Opammap karohīti. –*”, which is changed into “*Ten’āha thero Nāgaseno:*” in As.

(4) Mil 37, ll. 17-32 = Ps I, 82, l. 32 - 83, l. 3.  
= As 121, ll. 22-32.

In this example, a phrase in Mil, “*...uppajjamānā kusalākusalasāvajjāna-vajjhānappāṇīta-kāñhasukha-sappaṭibhāga-dhamme...*” (Mil 37, ll. 22-23) can be found only in Ps, not found in As. Instead, a short phrase, “*kusale dhamme*” exists in As. Therefore, as far as this example is concerned, As neither copied Ps, nor vice versa: it could be determined that not only Ps, but also As cited this passage directly from Mil as the original source.

---

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 92-104, esp. the table in p. 100.

(5) Mil 38, ll. 5-15 = As 122, ll. 2-10.

As is in Examples 2 and 3, this passage in As also starts with “*Ten’āha thero: –*”, which is written in Mil as “*Opammapañ karohiti*”. But the quotation itself in As, following the above phrase, is very well identified with the original passage of Mil.

(6) Mil 38, ll. 22-26 = As 118, ll. 23-27.

In this example, Mil starts the passage with “*Opammapañ karohiti*”, just the same as the previous Examples 2, 3 and 5, whereas As does it with “*Tena vuttañ: – Seyyathā pi ...*” The quoted passage itself after the above is well in accord with its original one in Mil, however.

(7) Mil 39, ll. 13-20 = Nidd-a I, 156, ll. 18-24.

= As 122, l. 33-123, l. 5.

This case is similar with Example 1 in the point that the quoted passage from Mil is found both in Nidd-a I and the other text. But these two texts have, in fact, a corresponding relation as follows: Nidd-a I, 156, l. 7-157, l. 4 (29 lines) = As 122, l. 22-123, l. 16 (30 lines). These corresponding passages respectively include the quotations from Mil in question. Therefore, these quotations were not made directly from Mil by the above two texts. Moreover, this judgment can be well supported by the following textual fact: each of the three words (or phrases) in Mil, “*padipam*” (ll. 13-14), “*rūpāni pākaṭāni*” (l. 15), and “*ariyasaccāni pākaṭāni*” (l. 18) has been coincidentally changed, both in Nidd-a I and As, into “*teleppadipam*” (Nidd-a I, l. 19; As l. 34), “*pākaṭāni rūpāni*” (Nidd-a I, l. 20; As p. 123, l. 1), and “*pākaṭāni ariyasaccāni*” (Nidd-a I, l. 23; As p. 123, l. 3). These alterations from Mil are identical with each other in Nidd-a I, and As. Accordingly, this accordance between these two texts derive either from that one copied the other or from the third common source. Yet, it would be not likely to have come from the third common source just like in the case of Example I, i.e. the case between Nidd-a I and Vibh-a. To the contrary, there are many instances that As directly cited Mil (Examples 2, 3, 4, 5, 6,

10, 11, 12 and 14), whereas no instance that Nidd-a I directly cited Mil exists at all. This textual evidence suggests the largest possibility that Nidd-a I copied As as to the passage from Mil in this case<sup>11</sup>.

(8) Mil 45, ll. 4-5 = Sv III, 810, ll. 31-32.  
= Th 90, verse 1003.

The passage quoted from Mil is a verse that can be found both in Sv and Th as mentioned above. However, the verse is missing from the PTS edition of Th: I supply it from its Nālandā edition (KhN II, p. 367, verse 1002). Although the possibility that the verse in Sv was cited not from Mil, but from Th, can be considered, it would be more likely to take it from Mil directly. Because there appears such a sentence as “*Dhammasenāpatinā p'etañ vuttam*” immediately before the verse in question in Sv, while in Mil there is a sentence that is not seen in Th, “*Bhāsitam p'etañ mahārāja therena Sāriputtena Dhammasenāpatinā*”. Needless to say, the above sentence in Sv can be regarded as an abridgment of the original one in Mil.

(9) Mil 60, ll. 12-19 = Nidd-a I, 166, ll. 1-8.  
= As 108, ll. 22-29.

The passages quoted from Mil, of Nidd-a I and As shown above are, in fact, identical with each other not only in the quotations themselves, but also in their preceding and following passages. These are: “Nidd-a I, 165, l. 21-167, l. 4 (47 lines) = As 108, l. 7-109, l. 20 (49 lines)”. This case is the same as Example 7 in this respect. The above common passages which explain about “*phassa*” contain the following noteworthy statement: “*Vuttañ h'etañ atthakathāyam: ...ti. Idañ ca vatvā idam suttam ābhatañ* (or *āhatañ*): (the quotation from Mil) ...”. According to the above passage, it is clear that the quotation from Mil was treated as equal as that from a source named “*atthakathā*”. Here the “*atthakathā*” is,

---

<sup>11</sup> Concerning As, see, *ibid.* p. 470.

to my knowledge,<sup>12</sup> the general name of one of the most important old source-materials for the present Pāli *atthakathā* literature, which originated in India and was later brought to Sri Lanka, where many additions seem to have been made more or less.

Moreover, we should pay attention to the textual facts that Mil was there named “*sutta*”, and that this name was used as it was by the later Pāli commentators, such as Upasena, the writer of Nidd-a. The same instance can be found in Example 17.

Incidentally, as far as the above textual evidence is concerned, as a matter of its classification, Mil should have been included in the *Suttapiṭaka* of the Pāli Tipiṭaka, i.e. the canon, although it is generally classified today as a semi-canonical or post-canonical text, as explained before. Then, regarding the name of the Chinese version of Mil, the *Na-sen-bi-ku-kyo*, of which “*kyo*” means “scripture”, it would be possible to consider that the original text for the above translation had already affixed the word, “-*sutta*” or “-*sūtra*” (scripture).

(10) Mil 62, ll. 10-21 = As 112, ll. 26-33.

The above place in As begins with the phrase, “*Vuttam pi c'etāpi therena: –*”, and cites a passage from Mil, which slightly differs from that of the present *Milindapañha*.

(11) Mil 62, l. 31- 63, l. 3 = As 114, ll. 22-25.

The passage of As starts with the sentence, “*Nāgasenathero pan'āha ākoṭana-lakkhaṇo vitakko*”, which cannot be found in Mil itself. The passages of the two are slightly different from each other.

(12) Mil 65, ll. 26-29 = As 66, ll. 9-11.

(13) Mil 67, ll. 7-8 - Dhp-a 1, 127, ll. 6-7.

Despite that the above passages are as short as only two lines, and have certain differences, it is quite sure that the above passage of Dhp-a is none other than the citation from Mil. Because Dhp-a

---

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 207-222.

contains the following passage as preceding to it: "...ti. Nāgasenatherena pan'assa pākatikaggisantāpato adhimattakāya ayam upamā vuttā:", and also because the quotation itself begins with the phrase, "yathā mahārāja", which makes itself an obvious key-word for finding the quotations from Mil, as written earlier.

(14) Mil 87, ll. 3-8 = Vism 438, ll. 5-10.

=Ps II, 344, ll. 25-31.

= Spk II, 294, ll. 22-28.

=As 142, ll. 15-21.

Of these four *aṭṭhakathās*, needless to say, Vism, Ps, and Spk are the works of Buddhaghosa (first half of the 5th C.)<sup>13</sup> and the order of writing is as that of the above. As for Ps and Spk, about 10 lines preceding and following the above places are also identical with one another: Ps II, 344, l. 31-345, l. 5 = Spk II, 294, l. 28-295, l. 7. Consequently, in the case of the relation between Ps and Spk, the probability that Buddhaghosa copied Spk down from Ps concerning the above passage, while composing Spk, is assured. In the case of As, however, the passage of the quotation from Mil shown above, is followed by 8 lines of the passage beginning with, "Opamman karohīti: Yathā Mahārāja, ...", which can easily be judged as from Mil (p. 142, ll. 21-19). Therefore, it is evident that the passage of As under consideration was never copied from any work of Buddhaghosa, but was directly quoted from Mil itself.

(15) Mil 102, ll. 9-12 = Spk II, 99, l. 32-100, l. 2.

= Mp I, 59, ll. 22-24.

This case has a similarity to Example 14. Both Spk and Mp are the works of Buddhaghosa, and they were composed in the same order as the above one. In addition, the 2 lines immediately after the above quotation from Mil are also almost in concordance with each other in these two texts, which leads us to conclude that the copy of the passage was done from Spk to Mp. Moreover, in the case of Spk,

---

<sup>13</sup> As for the matters of the authorship of the works of Buddhaghosa and of its writing order, see *ibid.* pp.469-470; 509-518.

the preceding passage of the quotation in question is: “*Vuttam pi c'etañ Milinda-Pañhe:*”, while on the other hand, in the case of Mp, it is: “*Imasmīñ pan'atthe Milindarājā dhammakathika-Ñāgasenattheram pucchi ... ?*” These two passages apparently show that the quotations in both texts were from Mil.

(16) Mil 111, ll. 9-12=Dhp-a I, 147, ll. 13-16.

The above passage is a verse passage in four lines; only the last one word differs. In Dhp-a, there is no statement that proves the verse to be quoted from Mil. Nevertheless, according to Example 13, it is certain that Dhp-a knew Mil in this respect.

(17) Mil 133, ll. 23-27 = Mp I, 93, ll. 4-7.

The point to pay attention to here is that immediately after the above quotation in Mp, there is a phrase, “... *ti suttam āhariñsu*”. This is to indicate that Mp regarded Mil as a *sutta*.

(18) Mil 144, ll. 4-6 = Sv II, 592, ll. 23-27.

This instance is rather exceptional: the original passage of Mil is not quoted as it is, but its abridged statement is given here in Sv. In addition, it is apparent that Sv refers indirectly to Mil, because the statement in question is as follows: *Keci pan'āhu: “Bhante Ñāgasena katamam khuddakanam katamam anukhuddakan' ti: Milinda-rañña pucchito: “Dukatañ Mahā-rāja pi khuddakanam dubhāsitam anukhuddakan' ti vuttattā Ñāgasena-tthero khuddānukhuddakanam jānāti”*. However the reference to Mil by Sv may be indirect like the above, it never indicates that Sv of Buddhaghosa did not know Mil. This can be well proved by Examples 8 and 21, and by the cases of the other works of his which certainly cited some passages of Mil.

(19) Mil 148, ll. 6-10 = Sp. I, 230, ll. 28-31.

This is a comparatively short passage and the passages of the two show a minor inconsistency. Yet, a key-word, “*mahārāja*” can be found in Sp: there is no room to doubt that it was a citation from Mil. This is the only case that Sp cites a passage of Mil.

(20) Mil 167, l. 26-169, l. 21 = Ps III, 369, l. 13-370, l. 2.

This is not the case that a full passage of Mil is quoted as it is, but the case that a digest of the original is stated in Ps. That is to say, 54 lines of the original passage in Mil concerning the Buddha's physical characteristic of having the pudendum in a bag (*kosohita vatthaguyha*) and *Sela Brāhmaṇa*, are summarized into 14 lines in Ps. Therefore, the passages of the two texts are not in literal concord with one another, nevertheless the passage of Ps definitely derives from Mil. Because it begins with a conventional sentence of Mil, “*Vuttam etam Nāgasenattheren'eva Milindaraññā puṭṭhena āha:*”, and ends also with another conventional sentence, “*Kusalo hi bhante Nāgasenā ti*”.

(21) Mil 168, l. 28-169, l. 21 = Sv I, 275, l. 28 - 276, l. 9.

Just the same as in the case of Example 20, the above place of Sv starts with a conventional sentence, “*Vuttam etam Nāgasenattheren'eva Milindaraññā puṭṭhena:*”. Accordingly, we have to regard this as a quotation from Mil. However, there exists no correspondent passage with the above in the present Mil. Its content is the same as that of Example 20, i. e. as to the Buddha's *kosohita vatthaguyha*, and if I dare to point out the correspondent passage in Mil, it would be the above, which is, in fact, part of the source passage for Example 20. Strictly stating, however, I cannot help thinking it a similar but different story, not only for the reason mentioned above, but also for the reason that there appear some persons such as *Brahmāyu Brāhmaṇa* and his two disciples, *Uttara* and *Bavāriya*, who never enter the field in Mil. In this respect, we have to examine the following two cases of probability: one is that a text of Mil which Buddhaghosa made use of in his writing Sv, was some version other than the present Mil, which was partially differentiated; and the other is that the so-called old *Dīghaṭṭhakathā* as the major source material for Sv, based upon which Buddhaghosa newly wrote the Pāli commentary on the *Dīgha Nikāya*, i. e. Sv, already contained some partly diverse passage of Mil. However, since it is certain for him to have used any text of Mil, the probability for the former would be much higher. Incidentally, there

is a *sutta* named the *Brahmāyu-sutta* in the *Majjhima Nikāya*<sup>14</sup> which tells that this *Brahmāyu*, at first, had his disciple, *Uttara* (here Bavārya does not appear) confirm the so-called thirty-two specific characteristics of the Buddha, especially those of the *kosohita vatthaguyha* mentioned above and of the *pahūtajivhatā* (the characteristic of a long and large tongue), and later on he himself met the Buddha confirming the same.

(22) Mil 236, l. 26-239, l. 28 = Sv III, 900, l. 31-903, l. 15.

=Ps IV, 118 l. 12-121, l. 15.

=Mp II, 11, l. 11-14, l. 8.

= Vibh-a 434, l. 10-436, l. 26.

As shown above, the quotations in this case are rather long and plenty. 95 lines of the passage of Mil are respectively quoted for 91 lines in Sv, 85 lines in Ps, 86 lines in Mp, and 85 lines in Vibh-a, all of which are basically identical with each other. It is very interesting that as for these four commentaries, much more lines including the above passage itself mostly are in accord with each other. The longest accordant relation lies between Ps (21 pp.) and Mp (18 pp.) as follows:

Ps IV, 106, l. 26-126, l. 4 = Mp II, 1, l. 1-18, l. 14.

Within the above extent, a shorter accordance is found among Sv, Ps, and Mp:

Sv III, 897, l. 22- 903, l. 15 = Ps IV, 113, l. 24-121, l. 15

= Mp II, 9, l. 17-14, l. 8.

The end of this accordance is none other than that of the quotation from Mil itself. In addition, within the same extent between Ps and Mp, the next relations of accordance are to be seen: Vibh-a 433, l. 25 - 439, l. 26 = Ps IV, 117, l. 20-126, l. 4 = Mp II, 10, l. 21 - 18, l. 20.

The end of the above accordance is correspondent with that of the longest accordance between Ps and Mp in question. The whole relations among these four are able to be illustrated as below:

---

<sup>14</sup> MN II, 133-146.

## Quotations from Mil

Sv

Sv			
----	--	--	--

Ps

Ps				
----	--	--	--	--

Mp

Mp				
----	--	--	--	--

Vibh-a

Vibh-a				
--------	--	--	--	--

In passing, the quotations in these four *atthakathā* texts, in common, begins with the following passage (with slight variations): “*Api c'etañ kāraṇam Milindaraññā puṭṭhena Nāgasenattherena vitthāritam eva. Vuttam hi tattha:*”

The names of the two heroes in dialogue, *Milindarāja* and *Nāgasenatthera* appear together here.

(23) Mil 300, ll. 24-25 = Vibh-a 408, ll. 17-18.

Although this is only a two-line-passage, it has a characteristic addressing name, *Mahārāja* in it, so that it is undoubtedly a citation from Mil.

(24) Mil 367, ll. 8-9 = Vism 45, ll. 13-14.

This is only a single verse. In Mil, it is solely inserted in a prose-passage, but in Vism it has three preceding verses, of which the first two are identical with the two verses, nos. 391 and 392 of the *Suttanipāta*, one of the oldest canonical text in Pāli. As far as we depend on the above textual fact, another probability that the verse-quotation from Mil in question might derive from a certain common third source, e.g. the *Suttanipāta*, from which Mil also took it up, cannot be denied.

The result of the above examination is to be summed up as below:

1) Among the quotations from Mil which can be found in various *atthakathā* texts, there are certain cases that were not directly quoted

from the original passages of Mil itself, but were copied from the passages of other *āṭṭhakathās*.

- 2) The works of Buddhaghosa contain plenty of quotations directly from Mil. Besides, there can be found some quotations from Mil in such commentaries as As and Vibh-a, both of which are traditionally attributed to him with certain doubts of modern scholars; Nidd-a I of Upasena; and Dhp-a. However, the commentaries on the *Khuddaka Nikāya*, such as the *Paramatthadīpanī* written by Dhammapāla (except for Dhp-a and Nidd-a) and also the *Pañcapakara-ṇāṭṭhakathā*, the commentaries on the five texts other than Dhs and Vibh belonging to the *Abhidhamma Piṭaka* do not have any quotations from Mil at all. In the case of Nidd-a, the passages of Mil are all copied from either Vibh-a or As: they have no direct quotations from Mil.
- 3) In some places of the *āṭṭhakathās*. Mil is expressed as “*sutta*” (scripture), and is treated as equal to the so-called “*āṭṭhakathā*”, one of the major old source-materials for the present *āṭṭhakathā* literature in Pāli.

### 3. Negative Remarks for Certain References

At the footnotes of various *āṭṭhakathā* texts or at some other places, there can be seen sometimes certain references to Mil as sources for prose or verse passages in the body. These are as it were the references by modern scholars. Some of them, however, have been concluded not to be the quotations from Mil, based on a careful re-investigation. Such negative examples will be taken up here and examined as follows.

- 1) Mil 15, l.5 = Ps IV, 52, l. 22.

In the footnote on the above page of Ps, a reference to the above page of Mil exists. The passage of Mil is: “*Sādhū Nāgasena, pāttacīvaraṇaṇa pātisāmehīti*”. while the passage of Ps is : “*Tatthasenāsanaṇaṇa gahetvā pāttacīvaraṇaṇa pātisāmēnti*”. The passages underlined in both texts, which are the very portions pointed out at

the footnote, are indeed not only very short, but also not entirely identical with each other. In addition, we are able to find a certain similar passage in Vin (II, 78, l. 22): "...pattacīvaraṇaṃ patisāmetvā..." As a result, it is almost impossible to regard the passage in question as a quotation from Mil.

2) Mil 133f. = Mp I, 87, ll. 3ff.

Prof. Mizuno<sup>15</sup> indicates that in the above places, the "five kinds of disappearance of the teaching" (*pañca antaradhānāni*) are expounded, and he thinks the passage of Mp as quoted from Mil. These five are: 1) *adhigama-antaradhāna*, 2) *paṭipatti-a.*, 3) *pariyatti-a.*, 4) *liṅga-a.*, and 5) *dhātu-a*. Nevertheless, of the five kinds of disappearance shown in Mp, Mil states only three of them: 1), 2), and 4), and the other two, 3) and 5) are not stated there. Consequently, although Mil might give some influence to the explanation of Mp, it cannot be considered that the passage in question was a direct quotation from Mil itself.

3) Mil 141 = Nidd-a I, 18, (ll. 16-18).

The footnote of the above page in Nidd-a gives a note, "cf. Mil 141" for the explanation of the term, "*advejjhavacana*" in the body. But regarding this term, the concerned page of Mil (ll. 3-5) shows only the following: "*Na'tthi tathāgatānaṃ atthāne gajjitaṃ amoghavacanā buddhā bhagavanto tathavacanā advejjhavanana*ā". This passage cannot be thought as the source for the explanation of Nidd-a I now in question.

4) Mil 167, ll. 24-25 = Ps III, 211, ll. 19-20.

One verse in two lines on the above page of Mil is in concord with the third and fourth lines of the five-line-verse on the above page of Ps: the verse of Ps is quoted from that of Mil. This is the reference at the footnote on the concerned page of Ps. Yet, the above five-line-verse is respectively identified with the five lines of Verse 360 in two lines (for the first and second) and of Verse 361 in three

---

<sup>15</sup> K. MIZUNO, *op. cit.* (n.5), p.53.

lines (for the third, fourth, and fifth) in Dhp. Therefore, the verse under consideration most likely is a quotation from Dhp, not from Mil. This verse of Mil is supposed to have derived either directly from Dhp, or from some other source, perhaps a common source to Dhp.

5) Mil 369, ll. 22-24 = Vism 270, ll. 16-18.

The above reference for a verse-passage can be found at the footnote on the concerned page of Vism and also in the paper of Prof. Mizuno<sup>16</sup>. And this verse is referred to in Mil as the verse composed by “*dhammasaṅgāhakā therā*” (elders compiling the sacred scriptures), whereas it is as the verse by “*porāṇā*” (earlier persons) in Vism. As has been discussed in my book<sup>17</sup>, however, this verse is found not only in Vism, but also in Smp (II, 407), Sv (III, 764), Ps (I, 248) and Pts-a (II, 490), which is none other than Verse No. 75 in my Porāṇa List<sup>18</sup>. In addition, in the five *atthakathā* texts headed by Vism, the verse in question as well as its preceding and following prose-passages are basically identical with one another. This textual evidence surely suggests that in this respect Smp and the rest copied Vism, the initial work for all the *atthakathā* texts. Anyway, it can hardly be considered that Buddhaghosa, the author of Vism altered the composer of the verse in question from “*dhammasaṅgāhakā therā*” into “*porāṇā*”, because he certainly referred to the name of Nāgasena as the preacher of Mil in many other places of his works<sup>19</sup>. Conclusively, we are able to state that this verse was originally quoted by Buddhaghosa from a certain source other than Mil.

6) Mil 370, ll. 11-14 = Vism 42, ll. 25-28.

This instance is a passage of two verses in four lines and is pointed out by Prof. Mizuno. But in the case of Vism, these two verses in question are the first and second verses of a three-verse-

<sup>16</sup> do.

<sup>17</sup> S. MORI, *op. cit.* (n.2), pp. 241-270 (a study of the Porāṇa), esp., p.265.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.* p.252.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Examples 15, 18, 20, 21, 22.

passage, while in Mil the third (i.e. the last) verse does not exist. Moreover, the two verses concerned are mentioned as those composed by “*thera Sāriputta dhammsenāpati*” in Mil, yet these are referred to in Vism as an “*udāna*” of Mahā Moggallāna. Accordingly, if Buddhaghosa had quoted these verses from Mil, he would have purposely changed the name of the composer of the verses to quote them. This supposition is scarcely thinkable: he is sure to have quoted them from some other source.

7) Mil 387, ll. 1-2 = Dhp-a IV, 173, ll. 1-3

This is again a single verse-passage, which has been examined by Prof Mizuno like the previous instance. In spite of it, this is recorded in Mil as the last one of the continuing three verses composed by “*thera Subhūti*”. On the contrary, in the case of Dhp-a, the verse is solely referred to as an *udāna* of an elder named Pabbhāravāsitissatthera. In this example, too, the verse cannot be thought of as a direct quotation from Mil itself.

8) Mil 387, ll. 16-17 = Dhp-a III, 468, ll. 3-4.

This case also depends on Prof. Mizuno's suggestion<sup>20</sup>, which is a single verse-passage. It is mentioned in both texts to have been versed by Cullasubhaddā. Despite the above accord, it appears in Mil as a sole verse, whereas it appears in Dhp-a as the fourth in the continuing seven verses. Accordingly, two probabilities are to be taken into consideration: one is the case that Mil cited only one verse out of the seven verses of Dhp-a, and the other is the case that Dhp-a added three verses each to both, before and after the one original verse, forming altogether seven verses as a result, though the latter case is more difficult to be supposed. With respect to the relation between the two texts in this case, however, the question which one was composed first, is still unable to be answered. Because the page of Mil now in question belongs to Section 7, the last one in the part of a later addition, so to speak, the Latter Part (of which I will state later), and the composing time of this section is

---

<sup>20</sup> MIZUNO, *op. cit.* (n.5), p. 53.

entirely unknown. Therefore, it is impossible, as far as this case is concerned, to determine which text was the source for the other: Mil might have adopted this verse directly from a certain original source for Dhp-a itself. There is, anyhow, no obvious evidence to prove that the concerned verse in Dhp-a is a quotation from Mil.

9) Mil 410, ll. 9-10 = Ps II, 387, ll. 14-15.

= Dhp-a I, 146, ll. 15-16.

A verse quotation is examined here. As the composer of this verse, Mil states “*thera Sāriputta dhammasenāpati*”, while Ps and Dhp-a refer together to the Buddha himself (Tathāgata or Bhagavat). Judging from this point, it is very unreasonable to conclude that the verses in question, of Ps and Dhp-a originated directly from Mil.

#### 4. *The Milindapañha as Revealed in the Atthakathās*

As has been mentioned at the beginning of this paper, in the matter of text critique of Mil itself, various scholars have already discussed this in detail, and the achievement has almost reached its final stage. Specifically, the researches of some Japanese professors are truly creditable by their broad view-points mainly based on the comparative study of the original text with its Chinese versions. These researches have been finally summed up in the study of Prof. Nakamura<sup>21</sup>. According to it, the part of pp. 1-89 in the PTS edition of Mil edited by Trenckner<sup>22</sup>, is the older stratum, or the original part, which has been further divided by Prof. Rhys Davids into three sections: the first section (: Introduction, pp. 1-24), the second (pp. 25-39) and the third (pp. 40-89). This part corresponds to the Chinese versions, and I name it the Former Part. The other part (pp. 90-420) is accordingly named the Latter Part; it is the newer stratum.

---

<sup>21</sup> NAKAMURA, *op. cit.* (n. 6), pp. 78-89.

<sup>22</sup> This is generally in concordance with Sri Lanka's edition of Mil, the original text for the English translation by Prof. Rhys Davids; whereas the Thai edition has many later additions.

This has been also divided by him into four sections: the fourth (pp. 90-328), the fifth (pp. 329-362), the sixth (pp. 363-419) and the seventh (pp. 419-420). The Latter Part is regarded as a later addition in the Theravāda school.

Now the questions are: Which part of Mil is quoted from in the *atthakathās*? – either from the Former Part or from the Latter Part, or from both?; Is there any textual characteristic as to the *atthakathā* texts that quoted Mil?; and so on. In order to answer the above questions, a simple list summing the relations of the quoted places in Mil with the places quoting Mil in the *atthakathās*, which has been made based upon the examination in Section 2. is to be shown in the following.

(Explanatory Notes: (1) “Number” <abbr. as N> at the left end indicates the consecutive number of the Examples; “Page” <abbr. as P>, the quoted paginations of Mil; “Section” <abbr. as S> in Roman figures, the divisions made by Rhys Davids. (2) The texts in parentheses refer to the fact that they are mere copies from their preceding texts in each case. (3) The line drawn between Examples 14 and 15 means the border between the Former Part and the Latter Part in Mil: Example 1-14 belong to the Former, and Example 15 and thereafter to the Latter).

N	P	S	Quoting Texts
1	33	II	Vibh-a, (Nidd-a I)
2	35	II	As
3	36	II	As
4	37	II	Ps, As
5	38	II	As
6	38	II	As
7	39	II	As, (Nidd-a I)
8	45	II	Sv, Th
9	60	II	As, (Nidd-a I)
10	62	II	As
11	62	II	As
12	65	III	As

13	67	III	Dhp-a
14	87	III	Vism, Ps, (Spk), As
15	102	IV	Spk, (Mp)
16	111	IV	Dhp-a
17	133	IV	Mp
18	144	IV	Sv
19	148	IV	Sp
20	167	IV	Ps
21	168	IV	Sv
22	236	IV	Sv, Ps, (Mp), Vip-a
23	300	IV	Vibh-a
24	367	VI	Vism

On the basis of the above list, the following points will be roughly cleared up:

- 1) The first part, the Introduction of Mil (Section I: pp. 1-24) is not quoted from at all, which does not mean that this part had not been composed yet in the period of writing of the *atthakathā* texts, but does mean that its content was not suitable to quote for the commentarial passages in the *atthakathās*.
- 2) From the Former Part, As quotes its passages most, but it does not use any passages from the Latter Part. However, it does not seem that As did not know the Latter; in other words, that on composing As, the Latter Part had not been added yet to the Former. To the contrary, the works of Buddhaghosa, such as Vism and others, quote many passages from both the Former and Latter, more often, the passages of the Latter. Vibh-a and Dhp-a also quote from both parts, though their numbers of quotation are rather less.
- 3) Concerning all the seven sections of Mil, most of the quotations are from Section 2, and the next most come from Section 4. As is the same as in the case of Section I, no cases of quotation from Sections 6 (in 34 pp.) and 7 (only in less than 2 pp.) are seen, but the quotation from Section 6 exists merely at a single place in

Vism. These textual facts seem to show that the original text of Mil edited by Trenckner had been formed as a whole by the time when the *atthakathā* literature was composed. As has been discussed in Section 2, Example 24 of this paper, however, if this only case of quotation from Section 6 of Mil was not really like that, but it derived from some other source, it will be limited to Section 4 only regarding the quotation from the Latter Part: Sections 5, 6, and 7 should be separated from Section 4, which would suggest that Section 4 had been added to the Former Part earlier than Section 5, etc. were added to it. That is to say, the addition of Section 4 and that of Section 5, etc. would not have been made at the same time. This consideration results to be the same as Prof. Mizuno's view.

4) With respect to the time of formation of the present text of Mil in Pāli, its upper limit cannot be clearly determined, yet its lower limit would not be later than that of the *atthakathā* literature. It goes without saying that the present Pāli *atthakathā* texts were composed by some Indian or Sri Lankan commentators headed by Buddhaghosa who did it in the 430's A.D. in Anurādhapura, the capital of ancient Sri Lanka.

The Pāli *atthakathās* were written chiefly based upon the old source-materials which were originated in India and which were later brought to Sri Lanka with certain portions being added there to them. The *Milindapañha* was one of such sources of Indian origin in a broad sense. As to the time of formation of the above source-materials, its lower limit, at least, can be decided by the search for the time of activities of all the Sri Lankans along with Indians coming to Sri Lanka, e.g. kings, monks, lay-believers, etc., who appeared in the *atthakathās*. Through a careful and exhaustive investigation in this matter, it was concluded that the major part of the sources was formed before the reign of King Vasabha (65-109 A.D.)<sup>23</sup>. Since then some exceptional additions might have been

---

<sup>23</sup> Regarding the chronology of Sri Lankan kings, "A Chronological List of Ceylon Kings", in *A Concise History of Ceylon* by C. W. NICHOLAS and S.

made to it; these had ceased by the reign of King Mahāsena (276-303 A.D.). After that period, these source-materials, generally called the Sīhaṭa Source, are likely to have been preserved without any addition and alteration until the first half of the fifth century when Buddhaghosa composed his *atṭhakathā* texts making full use of them<sup>24</sup>. The above is the chronological conclusion as to the content of the *atṭhakathā* texts. In any case, it would be correct to consider that the lower limit of time of formation of Mil which is quoted or referred to in a large number of the *atṭhakathā* texts, was approximately at the end of the first century A. D. Or if there had been certain later additions to Mil, they would have ended by the end of the third century or thereabout. Incidentally, some additions, which can be found only in the present Thai edition of Mil, must be certain newer additions made in Thailand in a very much later period. As far as the matter of a relation between Mil and the *atṭhakathās* is concerned, therefore, these newer additions should not be taken up as equal as the older additions made in ancient times now under consideration.

---

PARANAVITANA, the University of Ceylon, Colombo, 1961, pp.341-345, is adopted in this paper as the most recent and reliable one.

<sup>24</sup> MORI, *op. cit.* (n. 2), pp. 309-466, esp., pp. 457-466.